

NEW YORK HERALD

BROADWAY AND ANN STREET.

JAMES GORDON BENNETT,
PROPRIETOR.THE DAILY HERALD, published every
day in the year. Four cents per copy. An-
nual subscription price \$12.LONDON OFFICE OF THE NEW YORK
HERALD—NO. 46 FLEET STREET.Subscriptions and Advertisements will be
received and forwarded on the same terms
as in New York.

Volume XXXIX.....No. 492

AMUSEMENTS TO-NIGHT.

METROPOLITAN THEATRE.
No. 83 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10 P. M.TONY PASTOR'S OPERA HOUSE.
No. 201 Bowery.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10 P. M.SAN FRANCISCO MINSTRELS.
Broadway, corner of Twenty-ninth street.—NEGRO
MINSTRELS, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10 P. M.LYCERN THEATRE.
Fourth street and Fifth.—MUCH ADO
ABOUT NOTHING, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.AMERICAN INSTITUTE.
Third avenue, between Sixty-third and Sixty-fourth
streets.—INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION.COLLIERIES.
Broadway, corner of Thirty-third street.—STORM OVER
PARADISE, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.WOODS' MUSEUM.
Broadway, corner of Third and Fourth streets.—M. R. S. P. M.;
closes at 10 P. M.OLYMPIC THEATRE.
No. 64 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45
P. M.THEATRE COMIQUE.
No. 54 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30
P. M.PARK THEATRE.
Broadway, between Twenty-first and Twenty-second
streets.—GILDED AGE, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.STRAIN HALL.
Fourth street and Fifth.—REGINA DILLI, at 8 P. M.;
closes at 10:30 P. M.GERMANIA THEATRE.
Fourth street and Fifth.—THE WIFE OF THE MILL, at 8 P. M.;
closes at 10:30 P. M.BOOTH'S THEATRE.
Corner of Twenty-third street and Sixth avenue.—
HENRY VIII., at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.WALLACK'S THEATRE.
Broadway, between Third and Fourth streets.—THE
RIVALS, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
Broadway, between Third and Fourth streets.—RUY BLAS, at 8 P. M.;
closes at 10:30 P. M.NILES' GARDEN.
Broadway, between Third and Fourth streets.—THE
JALOUZE, at 8 P. M.; closes at 11 P. M.FIFTH AVENUE THEATRE.
Twenty-ninth street and Broadway.—MOORCROFT,
OR THE DOUBT, at 8 P. M.; closes at 11 P. M.FRITS CONWAY'S BROOKLYN THEATRE.
Broadway, between Broadway and Fifth avenue.—
VARIETY, at 8 P. M.BRYANT'S OPERA HOUSE.
West Twenty-third street, near Sixth avenue.—NEGRO
MINSTRELS, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

CATO VON EISEN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

The New Phase of the Third Term Discussion.

Within the last ten days, and especially
since the election returns were received from
Ohio and Indiana, the discussion of the third
term question has passed to a new stage of
greater interest, in some respects, than any
of the preceding. For some time previous to
these elections several leading journals, and
notably the Tribune, which had treated the
third term controversy as a political bubble,
came to regard it as a question of the utmost
gravity, virtually acknowledging that the
HERALD was fifteen months in advance of the
public thought in desecrating a formidable
danger to our institutions. Since Tuesday's
elections the flurry of the republican
journals on the third term is ludicrous.
They have become suddenly clamorous
to have President Grant and Governor
Dix declare their hostility to this
alarming innovation. The HERALD, which
takes time by the forelock, pressed this ad-
vice upon them at a time when compliance
would not have been open to the suspicion of
being forced by political necessities, or ex-
torted from party fears. In politics, as in
other affairs, much depends on timing things
rightly. It makes a great difference whether
seed is put into the ground in May or in
August. Had President Grant heeded the
sound advice of the HERALD and publicly re-
nounced all third term aspirations five months
ago; or had the Union Convention taken our
advice and passed a resolution favoring an
amendment of the constitution limiting the
President to a single term of six years; or
had Governor Dix adopted our later sugges-
tion and declared his opposition to the third
election of a President, the flutter of conster-
nation in the republican journals, which
are "wise behind time," might have been
avoided. "There is a tide in the affairs of
men." If a ship is to be got past a bar at the
mouth of a harbor it must be floated over at
high tide. If it misses the opportunity it
will remain landlocked, and its more enter-
prising competitors will get a start in the
voyage which no extra burning of pitch and
coal after it gets at sea will enable it to re-
cover. The HERALD kept giving good advice,
and the way it was rejected may remind one
of the fable of the Sisyphian leaves, which con-
stantly rose in price in proportion to the
number which were scattered by the winds
and lost. The whole collection could have
been purchased at first for a lower sum than
was finally demanded for the remnant. Had
General Grant spoken five months ago,
as the HERALD advised, the third term question
would not have cost the republican party a
single vote. When that opportunity was
squandered by delay we advised the Union
Convention to indorse the one term principle,
and if our friendly suggestion had been fol-
lowed the third term controversy would have
been extinguished and have given the republi-
cans no further trouble. That opportunity
was also lost; but the HERALD, persisting in
its desire to do good, then advised Governor
Dix to save his party and himself by publicly
declaring his opposition to a third term.
Had he done it then he would
have hit the tone of popular feeling in
a critical moment, and have won
strength and applause. General Dix also
failed to float his ship out to sea in the flood
tide. There may still be water enough on the
bar for him to get over by throwing out a
little freight, and it behooves him to make the
trial. But if he had discerned the drift of
public sentiment as early as the HERALD
did he would have been spared the embar-
rassment of making a decision under cir-
cumstances which expose his motives to mis-
construction.It is amusing to witness the sudden impor-
tance attached by the republican journals to
the third term question since the elections of
last week. The seditious Evening Post thinks it
is now too late for Governor Dix to accept
the advice seasonably tendered him by the
HERALD and repeated by the Times "a day
after the fair." The Evening Post said on
Saturday:—

Since the Times now repeats its advice to Governor Dix, we also will go a step further and say that his advice had better be bestowed upon President Grant. It is by the mouth and the pen of the President himself that the republican party should be relieved of this question. It is the continual indulgence in "third term" talk by the President's office-holders, and the toleration of such talk by the President himself, that keeps a popular mistrust which the Times now recognizes had much to do with the great republican reverses in Ohio and Indiana and tears will endanger a republic. But we do believe, and so also manifestly the Times believes, that there are thousands of republican voters whom the hypocritical talk of these office-holders, who would not have refused against Governor Dix at Utica had they dared, combined with the tactless assent of the President himself, renders uneasy and anxious.

For our part we think the Times' tardy advice to Governor Dix is still good, although it would have been better timed if that journal had sooner recognized the sagacity and pressed the views of the HERALD. A declaration by General Dix would have been worth infinitely more when we first urged him to make it than it can be at this late day. The Times has the grace to say that the third term talk "can no longer be deemed ridiculous." If our contemporary had had the courage to say two weeks ago what it is coerced by thick-coming political calamities to say now it would have done a better service. But tardy wisdom is better than persistent blindness. The Times confesses its slowness to catch the temper of the public mind, and trends, though far in the rear of events, in the footsteps of the HERALD in the following passage:—

We have, indeed, been rather disposed to laugh at the whole thing; but if the people look at it seriously it ceases to be a laughing matter, and therefore we advised, and still advise, General Dix to speak out whatever may be in his mind concerning it. Why should he be injured or the State be deprived of his invaluable services on account of the wild schemes of a few toolies of the administration? And if the democrats are determined to exhibit him as an advocate of the third term craze why should he not be at liberty to say what he really thinks about it?

We quite agree with our contemporary that it is not too late even now for Governor Dix to follow the advice given him by the HERALD at a period so early that his action would have proceeded from his own free choice, and when party malignity could not have charged that it was a signal of distress extorted from his fears. But better late than never. The third term question is a millstone tied to the neck of the republican party, and it is easier to cut loose from it than to go down with it, even after the sinking process has begun. It would have been still better to have untied the knot, as the HERALD advised, before being flung into the water, but a tardy knife is better than certain drowning. The

HERALD claims credit not only for the substance of its advice, but for its timeliness. The frightened republican journals which at last indorse the advice cannot turn back the wheels of time and restore the condition of things when it was first given. A shot at game within easy range is worth a dozen after it has fled to a greater distance. It is not our fault that the fairest opportunities have been wasted by slowness of perception on the part of our republican contemporaries; but even now the adoption of the HERALD's advice by Governor Dix may perhaps arrest the ruin which he might have forestalled.

Shakespeare and Bacon—A New Point in the Discussion.

Although we had closed the discussion of the authorship of Shakespeare, by the consent of those who had conducted it in our columns, we are well pleased to make room for a letter from the writer of the article in *Fraser's Magazine* upon which the recent debate was founded. As he introduced the subject to our American readers it is proper that he should have the last word; yet in printing his interesting communication we beg leave to point out what seems to us an extraordinary misconception both on his part and that of Professor Holmes. In the book of the latter, as quoted by the author of the *Fraser* article in his letter to us, Bacon's account is cited as evidence that Bacon indirectly admitted that he wrote the play of "Richard II."

This argument, we think, deserves consideration, and therefore we must ask the close attention of our Shakespearean students to the letter of the writer in *Fraser*, in which it is unfolded. Upon the interpolation of the following sentence from Bacon the whole question depends:—"About the same time," Bacon says, "I remember an answer of mine in a matter which had some affinity with My Lord's cause, which, though it grew from me, went after about in others' names." Professor Holmes believes that the matter which had some affinity with the cause of the Earl of Essex was the play of "Richard II." He believes that "Richard II." was used by the Essex party to make the rebellion they planned against Queen Elizabeth more popular. He says that the subject of "Richard II." was identical with that of the history of the first year of the reign of "Henry IV.," a book written by a Dr. Hayward, and dedicated by him to Essex. He shows that Dr. Hayward was arrested for writing this book, which the Queen thought to be treasonable. Then he says that the Queen was also incensed at the author of "Richard II.," and suspected Bacon to be the real author. He argues that "Richard II." was "the matter which had some affinity with My Lord's cause," and that it was this "matter" which, "though it grew from me, went after about in others' names." Finally, he concludes that the Queen suspected Bacon of having written the play, and that Bacon endeavored to parry her blow with a jest. Thus we are asked to accept the sentence we have quoted as meaning that "Richard II." had some affinity with the treason of Essex, and that the play, though it grew from Bacon, went about in others' names—that is, under the name of Shakespeare.

To us this seems a complete misconception of the text and of the entire story which Bacon relates. We think it perfectly plain that it was not the "matter which had some affinity with the cause of Essex" which went about in others' names, but that it was the answer of Bacon which was attributed to others. Reference to the anecdote will show this. The Queen questioned Bacon as to the treason in Dr. Hayward's book and as to the possibility of punishing Hayward for that crime. Bacon answers there is no treason in the book, but a great deal of felony—that is, Hayward had stolen his ideas from a Latin author, Tacitus; had translated his sentences into English and put them into his text. He says that this answer was his, and that afterwards it was attributed to others.

In the first place, there is no allusion to "Richard II." in the anecdote. In the second place, if Dr. Hayward was arrested for his book, and the Queen was angry that the play treated of the same subject, why was not Shakespeare arrested also? If she suspected Bacon of having written a play which was by the public ascribed to Shakespeare the surest way to discover the truth was to examine Shakespeare. In the third place, "Richard II." was claimed by Shakespeare only, and not by a number of persons; but Bacon speaks of something which grew from him but which was attributed to others. The play was never attributed to more than one; the answer might have been to many. In the fourth place, Bacon distinctly states what was "the matter which had some affinity with My Lord's cause." It is in the very next sentence shown to be "that book which was dedicated to My Lord of Essex, being a story of the first year of King Henry IV." It was the book of Dr. Hayward that the Queen was angry about, and it was Bacon's witty answer to her that he says was attributed to others. His purpose in telling the anecdote was to claim his joke, which, though it grew from him, went after about in others' names. Professor Holmes himself says, "So capital a joke did this piece of wit appear to Bacon that he could not spare to record it among his Apophthegms," and there it will be found under the number 58. We have explained this passage at this length because Professor Holmes and the writer of the *Fraser* article dwell so strenuously upon it as an indirect confession of Bacon that he wrote "Richard II." It is a singularly strained construction that they place upon it, and shows how easily and unconsciously a plain meaning may be perverted when the mind judges of facts in the light of a preconceived theory instead of forming the theory from the facts.

The general argument of our English contributor we need not examine, as it will certainly receive the respectful attention it deserves; but Professor Holmes' astonishing misconception of the language of Bacon it was necessary that we should explain. The other points of the letter, the scrawling of Shakespeare upon manuscripts of Bacon and the search now being made in the Probate Office of London for the inventory of Shakespeare's goods, which, it is thought, may exist among those musty records, are interesting, and may, perhaps, hereafter become important.

Mr. Curtis in Reply.

We print this morning another letter from Mr. George Ticknor Curtis, in which he speaks of our criticism as an argument *ad hominem*. We think our quotations from Mr. Webster were very different in logical force from a mere personal hit. If Mr. Webster had no other weight in this controversy than is derived from the admiration of his principal biographer Mr. Curtis might have said with truth that we had resorted to the *argumentum ad hominem*. But Mr. Webster is too resplendent a legal luminary to shine with borrowed light. No jurist, dead or living, who has written on this question can be thought to rank as his superior. We might have quoted him with as much logical force, though not with quite the personal pertinence, against Mr. O'Connor as against Mr. Curtis. Mr. Webster's opinions on this difficult subject derive peculiar weight from the fact that they were formed under a sense of official and professional responsibility—first as the chief adviser of President Tyler during the Rhode Island troubles, and afterward as counsel in the celebrated case before the Supreme Court. It became his duty to probe this question to the bottom, and the opinion of the profoundest constitutional lawyer of the last generation has a value quite independent of the indorsement of any admirer.

In Curtis' "Life of Daniel Webster" (vol. ii, pp. 126-7) we find a letter written by Mr. Webster, in the height of the Dorr controversy, from which we take this statement:—"The government of the United States pledges itself to maintain the existing constitution and laws till regularly changed." This is an admirable specimen of Mr. Webster's clear perception and apt language. It penetrates to the very pith of the controversy. The *de facto* government of a State is to be supported by the President "till regularly changed." There are several ways by which the existing government of Louisiana might be "regularly changed," but its displacement by the rude hand of violence is not one of them. One method of deposing State officers destitute of a valid title is by a writ of *quo warrant* or other suitable proceeding in the State courts. When a hearing has been had, and the Court issues its decree, force may then be employed if the spurious officers resist. But Penn could not pretend in the recent affair at New Orleans that his followers were acting as a *posse comitatus* to enforce a judicial decree. They were engaged in a mere act of unauthorized violence. Another regular method of displacing an illegal *de facto* government is through the subsequent elections. This method requires patience and delay, but it is thoroughly effective if fair elections are permitted. Yet as usurpers in possession might repeat their usurpation and render their power perpetual, the federal constitution has provided a third method of dispossessing an illegal State government by giving Congress power to decide whether a State government is republican, and to replace it if it is not. This is the only remaining way of making a "regular change" in the existing Louisiana government, unless the people prefer to endure Kellogg until they can put him out by a new election.

Mr. Curtis asks if it would have been the duty of President Tyler to uphold Dorr if Dorr had got illegal possession of the government of Rhode Island. That would depend on circumstances. If Dorr had remained in power, as Kellogg has, for nearly two years; if there had been meanwhile no other actual government in the State; if illegal violence had been stirred up against him, as was done against Kellogg, we have no doubt that it would have been the duty of the President, on proper application, to "maintain the existing government till regularly changed," and to forbear giving his official sanction to so dangerous a precedent as that mob violence is an appropriate proceeding against officers illegally in power. The duty of the President is defined in the federal statute. He is to employ force to suppress an insurrection in a State "against the government thereof;" the law does not say "against the legal government thereof," or "against the rightful government thereof," but nakedly against the government of the State; and from this language Mr. Webster argued that the existing or *de facto* government is always the one to be protected by the President "till regularly changed." The President has no power except that with which Congress has expressly clothed him, which is limited to cases of domestic violence against the actual government of a State. If the government thus protected, owing to illegality, usurpation or any other cause, is not republican, that is a question which Congress has reserved to itself for its own decision, and has never delegated to the President. It was necessary to clothe him with the other to meet sudden emergencies requiring prompt action, but his duty is confined to maintaining the existing government for the time being. He must leave Congress to judge of the necessity of other interference. Chief Justice Taney said in the Dorr case:—"It rests with Congress to decide what government is the established one in a State; for, as the United States guarantees to each State a republican government, Congress must necessarily decide what government is established in a State before it can determine whether it is republican or not." Applying this to Louisiana, Congress must recognize the Kellogg government as *de facto* before it can proceed to determine its validity. It is the simple duty of the President to maintain order and save the State from anarchy until Congress takes the subject in hand, or until the existing government is in some other way "regularly changed." The most pungent passages in Mr. Webster's great argument are those in which he exposes and ridicules the pretence that the Dorr affair was ever a *de facto* government.

THE POLITICIANS YESTERDAY.—It will be learned by an article elsewhere upon our local campaign that the politicians consider wirepulling upon Sunday a religious duty. This is upon the principle that the better the day the better the deed, for if by neglect of political duties on Sunday any immoral men should be elected, clearly their opponents would be responsible. Yesterday, therefore, was passed by these conscientious gentlemen in hotels and barrooms instead of in the churches, and the situation was thoroughly examined. The opinion was unanimous that none but good men should be elected, but on what constitutes goodness

there was considerable difference. We congratulate all these gentlemen upon their spirit of self-sacrifice in absenting themselves from the house of worship and devoting the Sabbath to such disinterested service. Truly the laborer is worthy of his hire.

Has Bismarck Retreated?

If the statement in our cable despatch from Berlin to-day be confirmed—viz., that the charge against Count Von Arnim has dwindled down to one of insubordination only because Bismarck dreads the further spread of the scandal—then it is plain that the Prince made a grave blunder in ordering the arrest of the ex-Minister. The attention of the whole world has been directed to this bold and exceptional step, and it was naturally thought that the Count Von Arnim had been guilty of some terrible crime. These are not the days of the great Frederick, when military law ruled the State and when the imprisonment of dignitaries and envoys was not a matter of surprise. The arrest of Von Arnim was startling, and required an extreme situation to justify it either on the ground of policy or that of right.

But if, after the parade of Count Von Arnim's offences, the seizure of State papers, the efforts to again embroil France and Germany, the attempt to use his position as ambassador to promote the interests of an ultramontane monarchy, Bismarck is alarmed at the prospect of the revelations which would follow a trial based upon these charges, he certainly is in no enviable position. His effort to browbeat the Count has failed, and prudence prohibits the execution of his threats. If Von Arnim, at the trial, which it is announced will take place three weeks hence, is to be accused only of insubordination, then Von Arnim is practically master of the situation. But it is rarely that Bismarck retreats, and his character is so well known that it seems almost impossible that he should have attempted to force his game with Count Von Arnim without calculating upon the results of a failure as well as those of success.

Miss Cushman's Farewell Engagement.

At a time when our stage has been taken possession of by the sumptuously dressed ladies of the society drama the reappearance of a great actress is an event that must stir the hearts of all who look on the theatre as something more than a place of elegant leisure. The return of Miss Cushman to the stage is an event of great importance. Under her influence grand pictures of human passion will replace the degrading sensationalism of the physical drama, and the theatre become once more the resort of people seeking intellectual amusement. Miss Cushman's genius and power are so widely known and recognized that it is not necessary for us to bespeak for her the respectful attention of the public. This she will command and more—the love and admiration which must ever attach to a life of honorable endeavor and triumph. The great successes of this foremost American actress belong almost to another generation, but the fire of her genius has continued to burn brightly, while the great stars that once illumined the dramatic firmament have dropped one by one from view into the infinite space of eternity. Miss Cushman, too, takes her farewell of the stage, and her present engagement will be the last opportunity afforded to the people of New York to witness the great creations which have secured for Miss Cushman whatever immortality the stage can give—a resting place in the memory of mankind with the Bettertons, the Siddonses, the Rachels, the Keans and the Macready. The disappearance from our stage of such a noble and commanding figure will leave a gap which must long remain unfilled. The public will not fail to mark their appreciation of the great artist who in her old age bids adieu to the scene of her triumphs in all the ripe maturity of her genius. Time, which has withered all else, seems but to have mellowed her intellectual gifts, and though the snows of winter have fallen on her brow she preserves the fulness of dramatic power which ordinarily belongs only to the earlier years of life. The three characters chosen for representation are Queen Katharine, Lady Macbeth and Meg Merrilies. In all three Miss Cushman has won world-wide fame, and it is peculiarly appropriate that she should select those rôles in which she achieved renown for her farewell engagement. We have no doubt that the public will pay its tribute of homage in a manner worthy of the great actress, and that she will carry with her into her retirement substantial proofs of the public favor.

The Financial Question in the Western Elections.

We think it a great exaggeration for the republican press to represent the democratic victories in Ohio and Indiana as a triumph of inflation and repudiation. It is true that the democratic platforms in those States give color to such representations; but platforms go for little against facts. In Indiana the most splendid success of the democracy was in the Third Congressional district, which elected Michael Kerr by two thousand majority. Mr. Kerr rejected and scoffed that part of the State platform which favored financial heresies, and yet he made the most brilliant and successful canvass of any candidate for Congress in Indiana. If inflation and Pendletonism were the popular issues in Indiana Mr. Kerr should have been the weakest, instead of the strongest, candidate in that State. A part of his strength is, of course, due to his personal character, which is highly esteemed; but he is one of the soundest and most outspoken men in the country on the whole range of financial questions. So, too, in Ohio, the most brilliant and remarkable democratic victory was won in the Twentieth Congressional district, where Paine, the democratic candidate, was a pronounced anti-inflationist and anti-repudiationist. Had these been the popular issues in the West Paine and Kerr should have been defeated or have stood lowest on the list of successful candidates, instead of leading the canvass in their respective States. The position of Senator Thurman should count for something in the politics of Ohio. He is the ablest democrat in public life, and he is a well-known opponent of the financial heresies which found expression in the democratic platform of his State. The most influential democrats who have been elected to Congress in Ohio and Indiana are totally opposed to all wild schemes of finance,

and they will be fully supported by the democratic members from the Eastern States.

A Day of Doctrinal Discourses.

The pulpits yesterday were not graced by so many Episcopal robes. Dr. Robertson, the Bishop of Missouri; Dr. Wilmer, Bishop of Louisiana, and Dr. Williams, Lord Bishop of Quebec, being the only divines of superior dignity who delivered discourses. Most of the sermons were of the doctrinal kind, even Mr. Beecher and Mr. Frothingham confining themselves to the discussion of principles. That the former should discuss individualism in the Church and the latter the inseparability of goodness and happiness are as characteristic in their way as that Father Salter should insist upon the real presence of God in the sanctuary and the sacrament at St. Patrick's Cathedral. We can scarcely give more than a catalogue of the discourses, which is the less to be regretted since in each case the title of the sermon indicates the argument. The Rev. Dr. McGlynn, at St. Stephen's church, in Twenty-eighth street, preached upon the parable of the unmerciful servant, enforcing the duty of the forgiveness of injuries; Dr. Wild, at the Methodist church in Seventh avenue, spoke of God's supreme love for sinners; at St. Mark's church Dr. Vinton took issue with the Darwinian theory; Dr. Warren, at St. John's Methodist church, discussed the question raised by Professor Tyndall as to whether prayer would prove efficacious in setting aside natural laws, and Dr. Snodgrass, at the Phillips Presbyterian church, in Madison avenue, chose as his subject God's love for the Church. Even Dr. Talmage, of the Brooklyn Tabernacle, confined himself to the lesson of St. Stephen's martyrdom, though perhaps he offended somewhat against taste in saying the apostle was stoned because of "a rousing sermon" he had just preached. There were only two exceptions to the general rule of doctrinal teaching, that of the Rev. R. S. MacArthur, of the Calvary Baptist church, who chose botany as his subject, and of the Rev. Dr. Fulton, who mixed a little politics with a discourse upon stealing. Yesterday was indeed a day of doctrine to the churches.

THE GRANT WEDDING.—The ladies especially will be pleased with our letter from Chicago to-day, as it gives the latest news of the marriage of the President's son next Tuesday. Who is Mr. Honore, the father of the bride, and what he has done; his standing as a citizen; how Lieutenant Colonel Grant first met Miss Honore, and when he proposed; the arrangements for the wedding; the fortunate clergyman who is to officiate; the names of the bridesmaids—these and other important matters are fully detailed. The trousseau alone remains a mystery, but of the wedding dress a vague though exciting idea is given by our correspondent.

ALASKA does not seem a good place to go to, according to the report of special agent Elliott, a summary of which we give to-day. That gentleman suggests several important changes in the government system, and objects to the effort made to induce Icelanders to settle in the Territory. Puget Sound is a better place, he thinks, but Alaska is hardly worth the seven millions that we paid the czar. The czar can only regret that bargain on the same principle of the Chatham street merchant, when he exclaimed, "O mein Gott! I am ruined! I sold a \$3 coat for \$20, when I might have got \$25!"

A GENERAL REACTION.—The democrats have elected the whole Congressional delegation in West Virginia. Is it that long expected and long, long delayed "tidal wave"? We shall know when New York and Pennsylvania are heard from in November.

PERSONAL INTELLIGENCE.

Mommsen is travelling in Hungary in search of Roman inscriptions. Skinner keeps a hotel in Chicago. It is a good name to keep a hotel with.

Mr. F. S. Chanfrau, the comedian, yesterday arrived at the Astor House.

The Burgundy vintage is good for fine wine, for the lower grades a poor crop.

In Vienna a second Arctic expedition, to sail next summer, is in preparation.

Sir Edward Thornton, the British Minister, left this city for Washington last evening.

Captain R. F. Ward, of Governor General Dufferin's staff, is sojourning at the Brevoort House.

Emile de Girardin will take charge of the journal *La France*, apparently without abandoning *La Liberté*.

M. Guizot lived to finish his "History of France," after all. The fifth and last volume will shortly go to press.

In Tripoli the plague is so severe this year that a repetition of its famous passage into Europe is apprehended.

Captain Philip Walker, of the Irish team, arrived in this city yesterday from Canada, and is at the Windsor Hotel.

Mgr. Dupanloup has given up Chambord, and now he no longer calls the Bishop of Orleans, but the Bishop of the Orleansais.

Guilford On